UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,722	03/12/2001	Brian Henry Stockley	EL727968517US	3163

7590 03/23/2004	EXAMINER
Siemens Corporation	THAI, HANH B
Intellectual Property Department	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	11

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08930

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 March 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to the Amendment filed March 8, 2004.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed March 8, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues, Choy et al. do not teach or suggest "...'save-as' function for data

structure" (pages 4-5). The examiner respectfully points out that the "save-as function" is used as

an option so that it can be operated, applied and included or not to the data structure.

Furthermore, Bolnick discloses a Microsoft Layout Editor including a save-as function (see col.

17, lines 12-20, Bolnick).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 1-15 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, 10, 11 and 20, the "electronics assembly engineering system" in the

preamble of the claims has no connection to the body of the claims or the bodies of the claims

have nothing to do with "electronics assembly engineering system".

Regarding claim 5, there is no relation between "an electronics assembly engineering

system" and "a computer-readable media...data structures". And how "an electronics assembly

engineering system" and "a computer-readable media...data structures" work together.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-13 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bolnick et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,043,817) in view of Choy (U. S. Patent no.

6321374).

Regarding claims 1, 5, 10-12, 17-18 and 21-22, Bolnick discloses a system comprising a

computer subsystem, which includes an electronics assembly engineering system, in which user-

defined data structures accessible to editor software (see Fig.1, Bolnick), and in which user

modifications to the data structures (see col. 5, lines 21-25 and col.17, lines 29-34, Bolnick)

during editing are made directly to the data structures rather than indirectly by way of a

temporary file, a method for permitting naming and manipulation of the data structures (col.4,

lines 58-63, Bolnick), the method comprising the steps of:

providing close, discard and rename functions for the data structures, if a newly created

data structure is being edited (see col.17, lines 40-46, Bolnick); "close" corresponds to "Exit"

function, "discard" corresponds to "cancel" function.

providing close and copy functions for the data structures if an existing data structure is

being edited; and excluding a save-as function for the data structures (see col.18, lines 1-29,

Bolnick).

Bolnick, however, does not disclose that the data structures have referential integrity.

Choy, on the other hand disclose referential integrity in data management system (see col. 7,

lines 2-26 and 27-39, Choy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Bolnick to include the referential integrity in the data structures

as taught by Choy. The motivation of doing so would have been to handle heterogeneous data

(see col.3, lines 566-67, Bolnick).

Regarding claims 16 and 20, Choy discloses a method for enabling data structure naming

and manipulation functions in a computer system (10, Fig.5, Choy) coupled to a display (110,

Fig.5) and employing transacted service, wherein the data structures have referential integrity

(col. 7, lines 2-26, Choy) and temporary copies of data structures are not created during editing

of the data structures, the method comprising the steps of presenting on the display (110, Fig.5) a

representation of a plurality of data structures (see col. 7, lines 1-26 and col.9, lines 1-5, Choy);

and providing a plurality of functions for either or both of naming (see col. 10, lines 35-41,

Choy) and manipulation of data structures.

Choy does not disclose the plurality of functions excluding a save-as function.

Bolnick discloses a Microsoft Layout Editor including a save-as function (see col. 17,

lines 12-20, Bolnick) as an optional and it is used as an option so that it can be operated, applied

and included or not to the data structure. Therefore, Choy and Bolnick combination teaches the

claimed limitation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify Choy to include the plurality of functions that excluding the save as. The

motivation of doing so would have been to handle heterogeneous data (see col.3, lines 566-67,

Bolnick).

Regarding claims 2, 6 and 13, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses the data

structures comprise objects (see 130,132, Fig2, Choy).

Regarding claim 9, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses the computer-readable

media is removable from the subsystem (see col. 3, lines 30-34, Choy).

Regarding claims 17 and 21, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses the

manipulation functions comprises providing close, discard and rename functions if a newly-

created data structure is being edited (see col.17, lines 40-46, Bolnick); "close" corresponds to

"Exit" function, "discard" corresponds to "cancel" function.

Regarding claims 18 and 22, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses manipulation

functions comprises providing close and copy functions if an existing data structure is being

edited (see col.18, lines 1-29, Bolnick).

Regarding claims 19 and 23, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses that the step of

presenting on the display a representation of a plurality of data structures comprises presenting a

graphical representation of a plurality of data structures (see abstract of Bolnick).

4.   Claims 3-4, 7-8 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bolnick et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,043,817) in view of Choy (U. S. Patent no. 6321374) and

further view of Ferrel et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,199,082).

Regarding claims 3-4, 7-8 and 14-15, Bolnick/Choy combination further discloses all of

the claim subject matter as discussed above, except Bolnick/Choy combination does not disclose

the data structures comprise mark-up language documents or XML documents. It is well known

in the art to use the mark-up language documents or XML documents in the page editor as taught

by Ferrel (see Fig.2 and col.4, lines 1-30, Ferrel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the mark-up language

documents or XML documents to manage the web page.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai   HT
Art Unit 2171
March 19, 2004

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER